

Relaxation and Rheology in Dense Athermal Suspensions

Peter Olsson

Department of Physics, Umeå University, 901 87 Umeå, Sweden

(Dated: September 12, 2018)

We study relaxation and rheology of dense athermal suspensions of frictionless particles close below the jamming density. Our key quantity, the relaxation time—determined from the exponential decay of the energy after the shearing has suddenly been switched off—is argued to be a determining factor behind the algebraic divergence of various quantities as the jamming density is approached from below. We also define and measure the “dissipation time”, which is obtained directly in shearing simulations and find that it behaves similarly to the relaxation time. Comparing shear viscosity with the expression for the dissipation time we identify a non-divergent factor that explains the need for correction terms in the scaling analyses of the shear viscosity.

PACS numbers: 63.50.Lm, 45.70.-n 83.10.Rs

As the volume fraction increases in zero-temperature collections of spherical particles with repulsive contact interaction, there is a transition from a liquid to an amorphous solid state—the jamming transition. This transition has for quite some time been studied through simulations in two different ways: by examining static packings generated by compressing and relaxing random packings, and by driving the system with a shear deformation. Whereas it was first commonly expected that these two approaches would show the same behavior, the evidence now suggest that they are clearly different. One example is the difference in the behavior of the pressure above the jamming density, ϕ_J , $p(\phi) \sim (\phi - \phi_J)^y$, which is linear, $y = 1$ for static packings[1] but appears to be $y \approx 1.1$ for the shear-driven case[2]. Another example is the isolated mode in the spectrum that dominates the behavior of the shear-driven system close to the transition[3] but which is not present in static packings.

One way to study the shear-driven transition is to try and eliminate the complications related to the softness of the particles and instead try and determine the behavior of hard particles. This is usually done by driving with sufficiently low shear rates, $\dot{\gamma}$, such that the particle overlaps become negligible—this is the linear region where many quantities are linear in $\dot{\gamma}$ (see e.g. Fig. 1 in Ref. [4]). This is so since in the strict hard core limit one expects particles driven with different $\dot{\gamma}$, to follow the same path through phase space, only with different velocities $\mathbf{v}_i \propto \dot{\gamma}$, and it then follows that many quantities (e.g. the forces) are just proportional to $\dot{\gamma}$ [4, 5]. The alternative is a recently devised method to perform shearing simulations with hard particles[3, 6].

The transition in shear-driven systems still appears to be rather poorly understood. There is e.g. no accepted value for the exponent for the divergence of the viscosity; determined values range between 2.0 and 2.8[2, 5, 7–11], and this appears to, to at least some extent, be because of the lack of understanding of the mechanism behind this divergence. To illustrate the complications we point out that one typically expects both shear viscosity $\eta = \sigma/\dot{\gamma}$ and the pressure-equivalent quantity, $\eta_p = p/\dot{\gamma}$, to diverge in the same way, but since $\mu = \sigma/p = \eta/\eta_p$ has

a pronounced density dependence[3, 11] in the relevant density interval, naive fits of $\eta(\phi)$ and $\eta_p(\phi)$ to algebraic divergences, $(\phi_J - \phi)^{-\beta}$, give differing values for the critical parameters. One way to resolve this issue is to include corrections to scaling in the analyses, but even though such a program has been successfully accomplished[2], this requires very high precision data very close to the transition and the scaling analysis becomes both difficult and opaque.

In this Letter we present results from relaxation simulations which are done by first driving at a certain shear rate and then stopping the shearing and letting the system relax according to its dynamics. The relaxation time τ_{relax} is then determined from the decay of the energy. We believe that this relaxation time is a fundamental quantity which is at the root of the divergence of pressure and shear viscosity. We also consider another time, τ_{diss} , which is related to the rate at which energy is dissipated in steady shearing and show that this quantity behaves similarly to τ_{relax} . We further show that η and η_p may be written as products of τ_{diss} and some ϕ -dependent correction factors, and we show that this picture nicely explains the need for corrections to scaling in the scaling analysis of Ref. [2]. The methods suggested here should be useful for studies of the jamming transition through both simulations and experiments.

We simulate frictionless soft disks in two dimensions using a bi-dispersive mixture with equal numbers of disks with two different radii of ratio 1.4. Length is measured in units of the diameter of the small particles ($d_s = 1$). With r_{ij} the distance between the centers of two particles, d_{ij} the sum of their radii, and the relative overlap $\delta_{ij} = 1 - r_{ij}/d_{ij}$ for $r_{ij} < d_{ij}$ and $\delta_{ij} = 0$ otherwise, the interaction between the particles is

$$V(r_{ij}) = \epsilon \delta_{ij}^2 / 2,$$

with $\epsilon = 1$. We use Lees-Edwards boundary conditions [12] to introduce a time-dependent shear strain $\gamma(t) = t\dot{\gamma}$. With periodic boundary conditions on the coordinates x_i and y_i in an $L \times L$ system, the position of particle i in a box with strain γ is defined as $\mathbf{r}_i = (x_i + \gamma y_i, y_i)$. We simulate overdamped dynamics at zero temperature with




FIG. 1. Relaxation of the energy at different ϕ . The figure shows the relaxation of energy after the shearing has been switched off. The preceding shearing simulations were performed at very low shear rates in order to stay close to the linear region; the densities and the initial shear rates were $(\phi, \dot{\gamma}) = (0.834, 10^{-8}), (0.838, 10^{-8}), (0.840, 5 \times 10^{-9}), (0.8408, 2 \times 10^{-9}), (0.8416, 10^{-9})$. To determine the relaxation times, τ_{relax} , we fit the energy to an exponential decay, only using data with $E < 10^{-12}$.

the equation of motion [13],

$$\frac{d\mathbf{r}_i}{dt} = -\frac{1}{k_d} \sum_j \frac{dV(\mathbf{r}_{ij})}{d\mathbf{r}_i} + y_i \dot{\gamma} \hat{x},$$

with $k_d = 1$. In this model dissipation occurs when the particles move relative to the steady shearing velocity $y_i \dot{\gamma} \hat{x}$. The effects of instead letting the dissipation be given by the relative velocity of particles in contact will be discussed elsewhere[14].

The key quantity in this Letter, the relaxation time, is determined through a two-step process: first the system is driven in steady shear at a constant shear rate $\dot{\gamma}$; then the shearing is stopped and the system is allowed to relax down to a minimum energy. As the simulations discussed here are at densities somewhat below ϕ_J , the final state is always a state of zero energy, and after a short transient time, the decay is exponential,

$$E(t) \sim \exp(-t/\tau_{\text{relax}}).$$

A few realisations of such relaxations are shown in Fig. 1. For each realisation the relaxation time is determined from the data with $E(t) < 10^{-12}$, where the decay is exponential to an excellent approximation. We determine $\tau_{\text{relax}}(\phi, \dot{\gamma})$ as the average relaxation time from about 10–100 such relaxations.

Figure 2(a), which is τ_{relax} versus ϕ in a narrow density interval just below ϕ_J , shows that τ_{relax} increases very rapidly with ϕ . The data are shown for a few different $\dot{\gamma}$ and we conclude that τ_{relax} at a given ϕ approaches a well-defined limiting value as $\dot{\gamma}$ decreases and the linear region is approached. In this Letter we analyze the data within (or close to) this linear region only; the behavior at larger $\dot{\gamma}$ will be examined elsewhere. We first determine the critical behavior from the eight points in Fig. 2(a) which are in the linear region and close below jamming, i.e. the points with the lowest shear rate for each density




FIG. 2. Behavior of the relaxation time. Panel (a) shows how τ_{relax} depends on both ϕ and $\dot{\gamma}$, which is here the shear rate of the preparatory run (the relaxations are performed with $\dot{\gamma} = 0$). Each value here is the average of relaxation times determined from a large number of different relaxations. At sufficiently low $\dot{\gamma}$, τ_{relax} approaches well-defined values that only depend on ϕ . Panel (b) is a double-log plot, only including the points with small enough $\dot{\gamma}$ to be in the linear region. The figure shows a fit to the eight points with $\phi \geq 0.834$; the points with $\phi_J - \phi > 0.01$ are not included in the fit.

in the range $0.834 \leq \phi \leq 0.8416$. Fitting these points to an algebraic divergence, $\tau_{\text{relax}}(\phi) = A|\delta\phi|^{-\beta}$, (where $\delta\phi = \phi_J - \phi$) gives Fig. 2(b) and the critical parameters $\phi_J = 0.8433 \pm 0.0002$ and $\beta = 2.73 \pm 0.15$, which are in good agreement with Refs. [2, 15]. The quoted errors represent max/min-values, corresponding to three standard deviations in the estimated quantities.

Our assumption is that this increase of the relaxation time as jamming is approached is the fundamental phenomenon which is at the root of the divergence of other quantities as e.g. the shear viscosity, η . The relaxation mode should be related to the isolated mode with frequency ω_{min} in Ref. [3], and we expect $\tau_{\text{relax}} \sim \omega_{\text{min}}^{-2}$. (The different powers of time here reflect the differences in dynamics. In overdamped dynamics there is a velocity that is proportional to a force, whereas one in vibrational analyses assumes Newtonian dynamics with massive particles where the acceleration is proportional to the force.) Note also that the lowest mode being *isolated* explains why the relaxation is almost perfectly exponential after the initial decay. One would otherwise typically expect $E(t)$ to be given by a sum of several modes with close but different time constants. A further result from Ref. [3, 16] is that ω_{min}^{-2} (and thereby τ_{relax}) diverges with the same exponent as the shear viscosity. This conclusion will also be reached below in a different way.

We will now try and establish a link between the shear viscosity, η , which is typically measured in both simulations and experiments, and the above obtained τ_{relax} . This will be done in two steps: we first derive an expression for a similar time, τ_{diss} , which is obtained directly in the shear driven simulations; we then express η in terms of τ_{diss} .

The expression for the dissipation time, τ_{diss} , is ob-




FIG. 3. Dissipation time τ_{diss} obtained in shear driven simulations. Panel (a) is τ_{diss} against ϕ at different $\dot{\gamma}$. Panel (b) shows the data considered to be in the linear region against $\phi_J - \phi$. The dashed line shows the result of a fit to the eight points with $\phi_J - \phi < 0.01$, giving $\phi_J = 0.8434$ and $\beta = 2.84$.

tained from a power balance. The idea is that the supplied power, which is $\sigma\dot{\gamma}$ per unit area, on average should be balanced by the dissipated power. Defining τ_{diss} such that E/τ_{diss} is the rate at which the energy is dissipated defines

$$\tau_{\text{diss}} = \frac{E}{\sigma\dot{\gamma}}. \quad (1)$$

Note that it follows directly that τ_{diss} should diverge with the exponent β since $\sigma/\dot{\gamma} \sim |\delta\phi|^{-\beta}$ and $E/\dot{\gamma}^2 \sim |\delta\phi|^{-2\beta}$ [4].

The dissipation time τ_{diss} versus ϕ for a few different shear rates is shown in Fig. 3(a). Just as for τ_{relax} we find that τ_{diss} increases rapidly when ϕ increases towards ϕ_J , and we also find well-defined low- $\dot{\gamma}$ limits, with deviations for larger $\dot{\gamma}$. Here τ_{diss} becomes *smaller* for larger $\dot{\gamma}$, which is the same behavior as in the shear viscosity, but opposite to the behavior of τ_{relax} , discussed above.

The rationale to introduce τ_{diss} was to find a quantity in the shearing simulations that behaves similarly to τ_{relax} , and thus establish a link between the relaxation dynamics and the shearing simulations. It is however clear that these two quantities cannot be identical. Since the initial dissipation in a relaxation simulation has to be the same as the dissipation under steady shear, τ_{diss} is equal to the *initial* decay rate in a relaxation simulation. τ_{relax} on the other hand is the decay rate at long times. This means that τ_{diss} should get contributions from all decay modes that are present in the system. τ_{relax} , on the other hand, is determined by the slowest mode only, since that is the only mode that persists after sufficiently long times. Since τ_{diss} gets contributions from modes with smaller time constants it follows that $\tau_{\text{diss}} < \tau_{\text{relax}}$. This is confirmed by Fig. 4 which, furthermore, shows that $\tau_{\text{diss}}/\tau_{\text{relax}}$ increases with increasing ϕ and appears to approach unity as $\phi \rightarrow \phi_J$. We relate this to the observation in Ref. [3] that the relative contribution to the shear viscosity of the isolated mode (in their notation, σ_0/σ) approaches unity as jamming is approached, which




FIG. 4. Relation between dissipation time and relaxation time. The figure shows that $\tau_{\text{diss}}/\tau_{\text{relax}}$ increases slowly as ϕ_J is approached from below. The solid line shows a fit to an algebraic function which approaches unity at ϕ_J . The dashed line is a parametrization to help compare the size of this correction with the other corrections to scaling in Fig. 5.

means that the weight of the other modes decreases. We likewise expect the contributions from the faster modes to τ_{diss} to become less important as ϕ_J is approached, which implies $\tau_{\text{diss}}/\tau_{\text{relax}} \rightarrow 1$. We summarize the above in terms of two conclusions of importance for the present work: (i) Properties determined in steady shear will necessarily be different from the properties determined from the long-time behavior of the relaxation simulations. (ii) This difference is however rather small and one should therefore expect results based on τ_{relax} and τ_{diss} , respectively, to be very similar.

A fit of τ_{diss} to the algebraic divergence (where we again use only the eight points in the linear region and close to ϕ_J) is shown in Fig. 3(b) and gives $\phi_J = 0.8434 \pm 0.0003$ and $\beta = 2.84 \pm 0.20$. Both values are close to (just slightly higher than) the corresponding values from the analysis of τ_{relax} , and this again suggests that τ_{diss} is a good approximation of τ_{relax} .

The finding that τ_{diss} to a good approximation diverges algebraically, gives a ground for understanding the need for corrections to scaling in the analyses of η and η_p in Ref. [2]. For the $\dot{\gamma} \rightarrow 0$ limit at densities below ϕ_J , corrections to scaling means that the divergence cannot be well approximated by the algebraic $A|\delta\phi|^{-\beta}$ alone, but that one instead has to use

$$A|\delta\phi|^{-\beta} (1 + a|\delta\phi|^{\omega\nu}), \quad (2)$$

which follows from using $b = |\delta\phi|^{-\nu}$ in the unnumbered equation before Eq. (3) in Ref. [2]. Here the correction to scaling exponent ω appears together with the correlation length exponent ν . This behavior is illustrated in Fig. 5(a) which shows both η and η_p versus $\phi_J - \phi$. Also shown is $\eta_E = \sqrt{E}/\dot{\gamma}$ which behaves the same as η_p , to an excellent approximation. (This is so since $p \sim \sum_{ij} \delta_{ij}$ whereas $E \sim \sum_{ij} \delta_{ij}^2$ [17].) As is clear from the figure, η and η_p behave differently, and attempts to determine β from algebraic fits without corrections, give $\beta = 2.35$ and 2.59 , respectively, as shown by the solid lines. Since one expects the asymptotic behavior of η and η_p to be the same, this discrepancy calls for including corrections to scaling (as in Eq. (2)), which was also done successfully




FIG. 5. Viscosities η , η_p , and η_E in the light of Eqs. (3) and (4). The dashed lines in panel (a) show the divergence of τ_{diss} with $\beta = 2.84$. The symbols show how η and η_p approach the presumed asymptotic scaling behavior, and it is clear that the corrections to scaling are much larger for η than for η_p . The same is seen by naively fitting η and η_p to algebraic divergences (shown by solid lines) which give $\beta = 2.35$ and 2.59 , respectively, where we note that the exponent obtained for η is further off the asymptotic value $\beta = 2.84$. Panel (b) shows both $\mu_E = \sigma/\sqrt{E}$, the similar dimensionless friction $\mu = \sigma/p$, and μ_E^2 (the correction in Eq. (3)). This last quantity appears to be linear in ϕ , which is consistent with $\omega\nu \approx 1$ as found in Ref. [2].

in Ref. [2].

We will now show that η and η_E may be written as products of τ_{diss} and some correction factors. After introducing $\mu_E = \sigma/\sqrt{E}$ in analogy with the dimensionless friction $\mu = \sigma/p$ (see Fig. 5(b)) we find using Eq. (1) that

$$\eta = \sigma/\dot{\gamma} = \mu_E^2 \tau_{\text{diss}}, \quad (3)$$

$$\eta_E = \sqrt{E}/\dot{\gamma} = \mu_E \tau_{\text{diss}}. \quad (4)$$

We note two things: (i) That the corrections of η and η_E are μ_E^2 and μ_E , respectively gives a very direct explanation to why the correction to scaling in η_p (which behaves essentially the same as η_E) is so much smaller than in η [2]. See also below for a direct comparison of these correction terms. (ii) As shown in Fig. 5(b) μ_E^2 (the correction factor that goes together with η) is linear in ϕ to an excellent approximation and the same holds for μ_E , though in a more narrow range below ϕ_J . Together with Eq. (2) we therefore conclude that $\omega\nu \approx 1$, again in agreement with Ref. [2].

As discussed above our starting assumption is that τ_{relax} diverges algebraically and it then follows from Fig. 4 that τ_{diss} is given by this algebraic divergence times a correction factor. To argue that the critical behavior should be determined from τ_{diss} rather than η or η_p , we now want to show that this correction in τ_{diss} that one cannot eliminate (if one only has access to data from steady shearing) is considerably smaller than the correction factors in η and η_E . To do that we write each correction on the form $(1+a|\delta\phi|)$ and compare the magnitude of “ a ” for

the different cases. We then find $\mu_E^2 \approx 0.0035(1+228|\delta\phi|)$ and (close to ϕ_J) $\mu_E \approx 0.061(1+88|\delta\phi|)$ and note that both these correction terms are clearly bigger than the correction in $\tau_{\text{diss}}/\tau_{\text{relax}} \sim (1-17|\delta\phi|)$ from Fig. 4[18]. This strengthens our confidence in the use of τ_{diss} for determining the critical behavior, though it is of course τ_{relax} that is the ideal quantity for such analyses.

The results above should also be useful for analyzing experiments, but instead of using $\tau_{\text{diss}} = E/\sigma\dot{\gamma}$ one could then make use of $\tau_{\text{diss}} \approx p^2/\sigma\dot{\gamma}$ which is an expression in terms of pressure instead of the elastic energy. This could be advantageous since pressure should be more readily available in experiments than energy.

The relaxation dynamics around the jamming transition has been studied before, but then with a rather different preparation of the starting configurations [17]. In that study configurations were first generated randomly, then relaxed to a zero-energy state with the conjugate gradient method, and after that perturbed by a pure affine shear deformation. The relaxation time was then determined from the relaxation of such initial states by fitting the shear stress to $\sigma(\phi, t) \sim t^{-\alpha}e^{-t/\tau}$ with $\alpha = 0.55(5)$, and was found to diverge as $\tau \sim (\phi_J - \phi)^{-\zeta}$ with $\zeta = 3.3(1)$. This exponent is clearly bigger than our $\beta = 2.73 \pm 0.15$. One possible explanation for this difference is that in the present study we have been very careful to apply a slow shear driving in the preparation step, whereas they in their work apply the pure shear deformation suddenly, which should be more like a rapid shearing. Indeed, as shown in Fig. 2(b) any given fixed shear rate would give too large values for τ_{relax} as one gets close to ϕ_J , and from analyses of such data one would expect to get a too high value of the exponent for the divergence.

To conclude, we have determined τ_{relax} from relaxation simulations and suggest that the slowing down of the relaxation as ϕ_J is approached is the fundamental reason for the divergence of η and other similar quantities. Strong support for this idea is obtained from the finding by others that there is an isolated mode that dominates the behaviour close to ϕ_J [3]. We have further introduced τ_{diss} which is determined directly in shear driven simulations and have shown that these two quantities, in the linear region and close to ϕ_J , are very similar. From the connection between τ_{diss} and η we further argue that the need for corrections to scaling in analyses of η and related quantities is largely due to the ϕ -dependence of $\mu_E = \sigma/\sqrt{E}$. Our results should also be helpful for getting more accurate determinations of the critical behaviour from experimental data.

I thank S. Teitel for helpful discussions and critical reading of the manuscript. This work was supported by the Swedish Research Council grant 2010-3725. Simulations were performed on resources provided by the Swedish National Infrastructure for Computing (SNIC) at PDC and HPC2N.

-
- [1] C. S. O'Hern, S. A. Langer, A. J. Liu, and S. R. Nagel, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **88**, 075507 (2002)
 - [2] P. Olsson and S. Teitel, *Phys. Rev. E* **83**, 030302(R) (2011)
 - [3] E. Lerner, G. Dring, and M. Wyart, *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. USA* **109**, 4798 (2012)
 - [4] P. Olsson and S. Teitel, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **109**, 108001 (2012)
 - [5] B. Andreotti, J.-L. Barrat, and C. Heussinger, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **109**, 105901 (2012)
 - [6] E. Lerner, G. Dring, and M. Wyart, *Computer Physics Communications* **184**, 628 (2013)
 - [7] P. Olsson and S. Teitel, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **99**, 178001 (2007)
 - [8] T. Hatano, *J. Phys. Soc. Jpn.* **77**, 123002 (2008)
 - [9] M. Otsuki and H. Hayakawa, *Phys. Rev. E* **80**, 011308 (2009)
 - [10] C. Bonnoit, T. Darnige, E. Clement, and A. Lindner, *Journal of Rheology* **54**, 65 (2010)
 - [11] F. Boyer, E. Guazzelli, and O. Pouliquen, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **107**, 188301 (2011)
 - [12] D. J. Evans and G. P. Morriss, *Statistical Mechanics of Nonequilibrium Liquids* (Academic Press, London, 1990)
 - [13] D. J. Durian, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **75**, 4780 (Dec 1995)
 - [14] D. Vågberg, P. Olsson, and S. Teitel, unpublished
 - [15] C. Heussinger and J.-L. Barrat, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **102**, 218303 (2009)
 - [16] E. Lerner, G. Düring, and M. Wyart, *Europhys. Lett.* **99**, 58003 (2012)
 - [17] T. Hatano, *Phys. Rev. E* **79**, 050301 (2009)
 - [18] The linear relation here is an approximate parametrization to help compare the size of the different correction terms. As shown in Fig. 4 we expect the true behaviour to be given by a different exponent.